

S/N 10/072,393

Response to Office Action Dated 07/29/2005

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

**Claim Amendments**

Claims 1-4, 6-20, and 22-28 were previously pending.

Claims 1, 6-7, 9, 12, 14-15, 22, and 25-28 are currently amended.

No new claims are added.

Claims 2-4 and 23-24 are cancelled.

Claims 1, 6-20, 22, 25-28 are pending.

**Rejection of the Claims****Rejections under 35 USC § 112 first paragraph**

Claims 1 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC § 112 first paragraph as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. At issue in claim 1 were the phrases "generic description" and "creating a display having an arbitrary height, an arbitrary width, an arbitrary resolution, and an arbitrary operating system platform," and in claim 14, at issue was the phrase "description of a display object." Applicant points out that these phrases describe concepts that are inherent in GUI arts where sometimes display objects may have no actual dimensions or appearance until they are actually rendered on a display, however, the rejection is moot as claims 1 and 14 have been amended for clarity, and the language at issue has been eliminated.

S/N 10/072,393

Response to Office Action Dated 07/29/2005

**Rejections under 35 USC § 102(b)**

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,001,697 to Torres, filed February 10, 1988 ("Torres" or "the Torres reference").

**Claim 7**

Claim 7 is amended for clarity, to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. No new matter is added. The tiered sizing schema of claim 7 may be used by a system such as that shown in Applicant's Figure 2.

Claim 7, as amended, defines a tiered sizing schema that includes:

a first definition for a size of a first-sized display object, the first-sized display object being defined according to first fractions of a height and a width of a display;

a second definition for a size of a second-sized display object, the second-sized display object being defined according to second fractions of the height and width of the display;

*wherein display objects of a GUI configuration received from an application program are adapted such that the display objects are resized for compatibility with an original equipment manufacturer (OEM) modification of the GUI configuration and for compatibility with an aspect ratio of a hardware display, the display objects being resized according to the first definition and the second definition. (Emphasis added.)*

Claim 7 defines a tiered sizing schema that allows the GUI of a given application program to be used with an OEM modification of the GUI and with a particular instance of display hardware—without having to rewrite the application. Thus, the tiered sizing schema can act as a "universal adapter" between the GUI of a given application program and an OEM's custom "look and feel" for the GUI as displayed on OEM display equipment (so that the

S/N 10/072,393

Response to Office Action Dated 07/29/2005

application program does not have to be rewritten to accommodate the custom OEM GUI specification and the custom OEM display hardware). Looked at from the perspective of an OEM, claim 7 can allow the OEM to use various off-the-shelf application programs in OEM equipment running OEM software, without having to rewrite the application programs.

The Torres reference, on the other hand, does not show or disclose adapting the GUI output of an application program to OEM software that modifies the GUI output and simultaneously to an aspect ratio of custom OEM display hardware.

Since Torres does not show or disclose all elements of claim 7, Applicant suggests that claim 7 is allowable over the Torres reference.

**Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)**

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-20, and 22-28 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Torres reference and U.S. Patent No. 5,796,401 to Winer, filed February 10, 1988 ("Winer" or "the Winer reference").

Claims 2-4 and 23-24 are cancelled, so their rejection is not at issue.

**Claim 1**

Claim 1 is amended to add clarity and more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. No new matter is added. The method of claim 1 may be used by a system such as that shown in Applicant's Figure 2.

Claim 1, as amended, defines a method that includes:

establishing a tiered sizing schema that defines multiple size tiers for display objects to be displayed in a graphical user interface (GUI);  
establishing readability constraints for sizes of text objects to be displayed in the GUI;

S/N 10/072,393

Response to Office Action Dated 07/29/2005

receiving a GUI configuration from an application program, wherein the GUI configuration includes display object instances, text object instances, and a placement of the display object instances and the text object instances in the GUI;

in response to an original equipment manufacturer (OEM) software modification of the GUI configuration, adapting sizes of the display object instances according to the tiered sizing schema and adapting sizes of the text object instances according to the readability constraints; and

adapting the placement to an aspect ratio of a hardware display.

The features of claim 1 are not taught or suggested by a combination of Torres and Winer. The Torres reference does not teach or suggest, for example, receiving a GUI configuration from an application program, and adapting sizes of the display object instances according to the tiered sizing schema; adapting sizes of the text object instances according to the readability constraints; and adapting the placement to an aspect ratio of a hardware display in response to an original equipment manufacturer (OEM) software modification of the GUI configuration.

The Winer reference does not add anything to the missing teaching of Torres. Winer too, fails to teach or suggest Applicant's features, hence the combination of these two references fail. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Torres and Winer.

#### Claim 6

For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 6 is also patentable. Dependent claims contain the language of the claims from which they depend. Claim 6 depends from claim 1. Therefore, claim 6 should also be allowable.

**Response to Office Action Dated 07/29/2005**

Claim 8 is dependent on claim 7, which was rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Torres. Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 USC § 102(b) rejection has been overcome, as laid out above. For at least the reasons described for claim 7, Applicant submits that claim 8 is also patentable. Dependent claims contain the language of the claims from which they depend. Therefore, claim 8 is also allowable.

Likewise, the Winer reference does not add anything to the missing teaching of Torres. Winer too, fails to teach or suggest Applicant's features, hence the combination of these two references fail. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 8 is allowable.

Claim 9 is amended for clarity to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. No new matter is added. The computer readable medium of claim 9 can be used by a system such as that shown in Applicant's Figure 2.

Claim 9, as amended, defines a computer-readable medium containing computer-executable instructions that when executed on a computing device perform:

- defining multiple upper left bounds of a display object to be displayed on a display according to a fraction of a height of the display and a fraction of a width of the display;
- defining multiple lower right bounds of the display object according to a fraction of the height and the width of the display;
- defining multiple sizes for the display object according to a tiered sizing schema for display object sizes;

S/N 10/072,393

Response to Office Action Dated 07/29/2005

receiving a GUI configuration from an application program, wherein the GUI configuration specifies the display object, an upper left bound, a lower right bound, and a size of the display object;

adapting the upper left bound, the lower right bound, and the size to an original equipment manufacturer (OEM) modification of the GUI configuration and to an aspect ratio of a hardware display by selecting one of the defined multiple upper left bounds, one of the defined lower right bounds, and one of the defined sizes.

The features of claim 9 are not taught or suggested by Torres and Winer, either alone or in combination. The references do not teach or suggest, for example, receiving a GUI configuration from an application program, and adapting the upper left bound, the lower right bound, and the size of a display object in the GUI to an original equipment manufacturer (OEM) modification of the GUI configuration and to an aspect ratio of a hardware display by selecting one of the defined multiple upper left bounds, one of the defined lower right bounds, and one of the defined sizes for the display object.

Since Torres does not teach or suggest these elements, and Winer does not cure the missing teaching in Torres, the combination of these two references fails. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is allowable over Torres and Winer.

#### Claims 10-13

For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 9, Applicant submits that claims 10-13 are also patentable. Dependent claims contain the language of the claims from which they depend. Claims 10-13 depend from claim 9. Therefore, claims 10-13 are also allowable.

S/N 10/072,393

Response to Office Action Dated 07/29/2005

Claim 14

Claim 14 is amended for clarity to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. No new matter is added. The method of claim 14 can be performed by a system such as that shown in Applicant's Figure 2.

Claim 14, as amended, defines a method that includes:

defining visual aspects of a graphical user interface to render on a display, the graphical user interface containing at least one display object, wherein size and location information regarding the display object are received from an application that utilizes the graphical user interface;

in response to a modification of the display object by an original equipment manufacturer (OEM) software and in response to sensing an aspect ratio of a hardware display, redefining the size and location information in accordance with a tiered sizing schema.

The features of claim 14 are not taught or suggested by a combination of Winer, by Torres, or by a combination Winer and Torres. The Winer reference, for example, does not teach or suggest, redefining the size and location information of a display object from an application in accordance with a tiered sizing schema in response to a modification of the display object by an original equipment manufacturer (OEM) software and in response to sensing an aspect ratio of a hardware display.

The Torres reference does not add anything to the missing teaching of Winer. Torres too, fails to teach or suggest Applicant's features, hence the combination of these two references fail. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 14 is allowable over the combination of Winer and Torres.

S/N 10/072,393

Response to Office Action Dated 07/29/2005

Claims 15-20

For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 14, Applicant submits that claims 15-20 are also allowable. Dependent claims contain the language of the claims from which they depend. Claims 15-20 depend from claim 14. Therefore, claims 15-20 are also allowable.

Claim 22

Claim 22 is amended to add clarity and more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. No new matter is added. The system of claim 22 may be implemented as in Applicant's Figure 2.

Claim 22, as amended, defines a system that includes:

- a display rendering module to:
  - receive a configuration for a graphical user interface (GUI) from an application program, wherein the GUI includes display objects and wherein the GUI is potentially usable on different display hardwares having different height, width, resolution, and operating system platform characteristics;
  - the display rendering module to define a tiered sizing schema for display objects in the graphical user interface;
  - the display rendering module to receive a modification of the configuration from an original equipment manufacturer (OEM) software;
  - the display rendering module to select tiered sizes for the display objects in order to transform the GUI configuration from the application program into the modified GUI configuration of the OEM software;
  - the display rendering module to scale locations of the display objects in the GUI to an aspect ratio of one of the display hardwares;
- and
- one of the display hardwares having the aspect ratio, to display the GUI.

The features of claim 22 are not taught or suggested by a combination of Torres and Winer. The Torres reference does not teach or suggest, for example, a



S/N 10/072,393

Response to Office Action Dated 07/29/2005

display rendering module to receive a configuration for a GUI from an application program, wherein the GUI includes display objects and wherein the GUI is potentially usable on different display hardwares having different height, width, resolution, and operating system platform characteristics, where the display rendering module defines a tiered sizing schema for display objects in the graphical user interface, and receives a modification of the configuration from an original equipment manufacturer (OEM) software, and selects tiered sizes for the display objects in order to transform the GUI configuration from the application program into the modified GUI configuration of the OEM software, and scales locations of the display objects in the GUI to an aspect ratio of one of the display hardwares.

The Winer reference does not add anything to the missing teaching of Torres. Winer too, fails to teach or suggest Applicant's features, hence the combination of these two references fail. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 22 is allowable over the combination of Torres and Wincr.

#### Claims 25-28

For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 22, Applicant submits that claims 25-28 are also allowable. Dependent claims contain the language of the claims from which they depend. Claims 25-28 depend from claim 22. Therefore, claims 25-28 are also allowable.

#### CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully suggests that claims 1, 6-20, 22, and 25-28 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain


S/N 10/072,393

Response to Office Action Dated 07/29/2005

unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 7-21-05

By:   
Lee & Hayes PLLC  
Mark C. Farrell  
Reg. No. 45,988  
(509) 324-9256